



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

siderable amounts of material in their lines are to be found.

For this purpose some uniform method of estimating the size of the holdings should be agreed upon. The usual one of stating that a library contains so many volumes and so many pamphlets, as provided for by the rules of the A. L. A., is better than nothing, but it is not entirely satisfactory. Mr. Currier has pointed out that the older libraries have many volumes of bound pamphlets, the value of which is not adequately measured by the number of the volumes. On the other hand, the number of titles is also inadequate, because a collection may be rich in volumes of periodicals or other serials. Is there not wanted a term which will signify the total of pamphlets, whether bound or unbound, and bound volumes, except those made up of pamphlets? Would "pieces" be satisfactory? The name is not very important because the term would be defined in the beginning and only numbers given in the body of the work. A single number would be clearer to the users of the list than two or more, as well as more economical.

The arrangement should be a classed one. For instance, special collections on coleoptera should follow those on entomology and those again on zoology. With such an arrangement an index will refer to all the information available, whereas an alphabetized arrangement of the subjects would require many cross references and still not insure this comprehensiveness. Moreover, a considerable economy in printing and a

greater legibility of the page could be secured by varying the degree of division of the classes in accordance with the number of entries on them. For instance, under English drama, Shakespeare would of course be treated separately, but most of the minor dramatists would be included under the general heading, stating of course the name of the author or authors to which each collection is devoted.

The system of classification should be one in print and in fairly general use; in other words, either the Decimal or that of the Library of Congress.

It is not proposed to take a census of the library resources of the country, which indeed would be a formidable undertaking, but one of special research material. It would therefore take no account of moderate sized general collections containing few unusual books and so would exclude most of the holdings of most libraries and include all the holdings of very few, if any.

Many interesting and important details could be determined only by investigation and after careful consideration, but the object appears to me both desirable and feasible and I would suggest the appointment of a committee to take it up.

(In the discussion which followed a general approval of the plan was expressed. Several units in which the size of the collection could be stated were proposed, among them "titles" and "titles and numbers." One member of the section called attention to the desirability of giving the dates covered by the collection whenever these could be stated definitely.)

## THE RETURN OF COÖPERATIVE INDEXING

By E. C. RICHARDSON, *Librarian, Princeton University*

The huge increase in the output of books since the cheapening of printing and paper, together with the increasing tendency to produce in the form of collective monographs by various authors; periodicals, transactions, festschriften, and even

encyclopedias with long signed articles, make the matter of analytical cataloging, or whole-article indexing, one of the most urgent of library problems. Literature has become a labyrinth and the need of a clue to it imperative. The vast waste of

research time involved in the present situation, and the still vaster failure of research students to reach their material, has become intolerable.

Of course, it is not a new problem and attempts at its solution have been many. These may be distinguished into three main forms, (1) an analytical catalog of the contents of a library; (2) analytical whole-article indexes to a given class of periodicals or other polygraphic works; (3) special bibliographies containing analytical references to a given subject.

The catalogs of the Boston Athenaeum, Brooklyn Public Library and Peabody Institute are types of the analytical printed catalog of a general library, but the type is obsolete. If all American libraries of the size of these libraries should prepare and publish such catalogs, millions of dollars worth of purely duplicate cataloging would be involved. There is a certain tiny advantage in having a catalog which represents only books which can be found in a certain library, but it is an advantage gained at undue expense.

What is true of the printed analytical catalog is true also in part of the analytical card catalog. Individual analysis of periodicals and transactions is now rare, but there are still sporadic attempts even at this, sometimes from mere lack of judgment and sometimes from despair over the lack of general indexes. This is most true of very specialized collections where the index need is most felt. In the larger libraries it has become not only a matter of clerical expense but of overloading the card catalog. A few libraries still dare to include A. L. A. cards, but most libraries are bent on weeding analyticals rather than multiplying them. Many libraries practically eliminate from their catalogs all periodical, transaction and encyclopedia references, but most continue the analysis of non-serial polygraphy and the duplicate cost which results from the independent analyzing of tens of thousands of sets is something tremendous. The temptation to this cataloging extravagance comes from the inexhaustive and un-

systematic character of existing bibliographical aids and the paucity of whole-article indexes.

It cannot be denied that the help of the bibliographies is very great. Works such as those of Chevalier, Potthast and other historical handbooks, the "Index medicus," the "Catalog of scientific literature," and so on, are incredible time savers, but they are far from covering the whole field systematically.

Whatever may be true from the standpoint of special students as to bibliographies, the ideal solution of the polygraphy problem from the library standpoint (i. e., the greatest good of the greatest number of students and of those who make bibliographies for these special students), is the whole-article index, exhaustive as to each work included.

Like the bibliography, the whole-article index does not show that a given title is in a particular library, but on the other hand it has two by-products of value, (1) it shows the purchase department of a library what is lacking and (2) in these days of inter-library lending and joint lists, it shows that an article can be found in other libraries and perhaps in what libraries. Therefore librarians will pretty generally agree that the right solution of the huge problem of modern polygraphic literature is the exhaustive, analytical, whole-article index.

It is generally agreed also that the ideal form for such indexes is triple—author, alphabetical subject and classed. There is still discussion as to the relative merits of alphabetical subject and classed for various kinds of use, in case one form only can be had, but there is no dispute as to the ideal. It is quite generally agreed too that the alphabetical subject index is the most practical and most fruitful first aid. The problem is chiefly how to get enough of it.

The modern history of practical whole-article indexing begins with the index to periodicals by Poole, first alone and then by co-operation. It is true that there were whole-article indexes before his day, but

he began the modern era. Poole's was an alphabetical subject whole-article index, printed in pages, forming a book, sold at a uniform price. It was an index of general periodicals, shading from the popular to the semi-professional, but distinctly not an index to research periodicals, and including only periodicals in English. Begun as an individual enterprise, it outgrew the powers of one man and coöperation was then introduced successfully, thanks largely to the indefatigable editing of Mr. Fletcher.

For many years the Poole compilation was conducted on the coöperative basis. Many of us contended all along that this was only a makeshift, and necessarily a makeshift. The best coöperation, we said, was not voluntary, but from an organized and paid clerical force.

Alongside indexes to general periodicals, there have appeared a number of special indexes; indexes to law periodicals, to scientific periodicals, to religious periodicals, etc. Some of these have been in the alphabetical form, some classified, some page-printed, others printed on cards, some voluntary and some commercial.

When "Poole's index" graduated into the "Cumulative index," it seemed that the principle of indexing on the ordinary commercial basis of book production and purchase had won out. The principle of voluntary coöperation had, it seemed, been finally merged in a proper business system. The problem was, however, no sooner solved than it reappeared. More periodicals were wanted, and the commercial publishers devised a service charge in proportion to the number of periodicals taken by a given library and included in the list. The method was plausible but there was an instinctive resentment of it. The idea that one library should pay \$250 for a book which another library could get for \$10, seemed *prima facie*, unfair. The publishers, however, were convinced of its reasonableness. Why should not a library which has twenty-five times as many periodicals pay twenty-five times as much for indexing? It would cost

this library twenty-five times as much as the other if it were to index for itself. Why not pay for service? However, it is evident that very many of the small libraries use this index, not merely as a guide to the contents of their own periodicals, but as a bibliographical guide to their readers who find the periodicals where they can in other public libraries, naturally, and on the average, in the nearest big public library. It therefore serves the small library in many ways; it reduces the number of periodicals that it needs to take, it enables its natural constituents to get the major benefit from the other libraries.

On the other hand, the benefit of the large library is chiefly as a guide for its own natural constituents to its own collections. The service by it to the constituents of smaller libraries in remoter places is only an additional weight. However useful to the world and desirable on general principles, it is an additional pull on the particular administrative force of the library, which means, of course, on the funds available for indexing as well as other matters. It may, therefore, be argued that its use to the small library, or at least to a certain class of medium sized libraries, well situated as to other libraries, is certainly greater in proportion to size and general usefulness than the use to a larger library. This becomes an *a fortiori* matter for the hundreds of public libraries, large or small, in the suburbs of New York. The value of the "Cumulative index" to these libraries may conceivably be more for the use of New York collections than for their own collections.

Again and still more to the point is the fact that small libraries get 100 per cent service where large ones may get, perhaps, not more than 10 per cent. Every periodical in a small library is indexed. Further than this, the actual service rendered in a research library is, magazine for magazine, less than in the popular library.

On the whole the trouble seems to lie not so much in the principle of the service charge as in the fact that the "Index"

gives a thorough service to small libraries only.

The long and short of the matter seems to be that commercial indexing is strictly applicable only to the popular periodicals for the popular libraries—a few hundred at most. For the vastly greater problem of research libraries with their thousands of serials, other means must be devised.

Such means are twofold; endowment and coöperation. Undoubtedly the most consistent and economical results would be had from support such as the "Index medicus" and the "Catalog of scientific literature" have had, but the problem is growing more pressing to the research libraries every day and it would seem as if libraries would be forced to take up old fashioned coöperation again.

A very extensive experiment in this direction has been made through the A. L. A. periodical cards, which have been prepared coöperatively. Many of us have subscribed to these with joy as a great deal less than half a loaf, but much better than nothing. Even these, however, are now languishing.<sup>1</sup>

The very suggestion of a return to coöperative methods raises again the question whether the best coöperation after all is not through money exchange rather than the barter of labor. Is the Wilson service system not perhaps, after all, sound in principle, however unjust in its applications?

Take the obvious, clean-cut matter of the analysis of current non-serial polygraphy. It seems clear enough that by a proper distribution of this material among the forty or fifty libraries which take the books every forty or fifty sets might be done one each by the libraries and all have results of this doing. Granted all the expenses of postage and editing, there is evidently a very wide margin of saving.

Take again the situation and unite with it the idea of which Dr. C. W. Andrews is so ardent a champion, that all new

books, imported or native, needed for research libraries and not to be cataloged by the Library of Congress, should be cataloged upon cards in New York, and we have the possibility of also analyzing these books there and paying a proportionate share of cost.

There is a very practical psychological difficulty at this point in getting trustees to put up advance cash for such an enterprise. It is something like a service charge in this respect, but the proposition is a clear one and it might be possible to work it on this or some combination of a more commercial character. It might be possible, for example, for a number of libraries to guarantee the cost of publication, or guarantee the sale of a certain number of copies, copies themselves being sold however, at a uniform price to all. If the work were organized to be done, say by the Wilson Company itself, since it is in New York, they might either take it up as a simple matter of printing and publishing after the material contributed by various libraries and edited was ready for the press, or they might undertake also the editing of the material, or they might undertake the analysis as well, in every event, however, on a guarantee or a fixed volume price. An attempt might be made to get the support of some of the endowments for research and education, and if this failed it ought to be not only possible, but an obvious duty for the libraries to take up the matter definitely and to extend it not only to non-serial material, but also to periodicals and transactions, in fields not now cared for, and especially in the fields of history, language and the social sciences.

In the worst event, the forty or fifty libraries concerned in this matter can afford to return to the plain, old, Poole method for various definite large classes of books and should do so, unless in the near future, an "Index medicus" and "Surgeon General's catalog" can be provided for the other branches of learning.

The "Cumulative index" serves the pop-

---

<sup>1</sup>Due of course to the war, which makes it impossible to secure the periodicals to be indexed.—EDITOR.

ular library admirably—it hardly touches the needs of research libraries. Efforts to mix the functions have resulted in small gain and much irritation. The need

is to distinguish and fill the research want as the popular need is now filled—and the only method in sight seems a return to Poole coöperation.

### LIBRARY LEGISLATION

BY EDMUND L. CRAIG, *Trustee, Evansville (Ind.) Public Library*

The events of the immediate past have thrust upon the attention of all mankind the world-wide question of the education and enlightenment of the masses. When the czar of all the Russias is hurled from his throne in a night; when Spain's soldiery attempt to take upon themselves the adjustment of national affairs; when we see in action the great fighting machine which we are told the kaiser has taken years to build; when we are startled by the quick-moving events of a Sinn Fein rebellion; when, in fact, we hear of any of the events of world-wide importance, the news of which we have grown accustomed lately to expect with each issue of our daily paper, we unconsciously think of the masses back of these great movements, and the effect which the enlightenment or unenlightenment of these masses has and will have upon each particular movement, and upon the world at large.

We who believe "that all power is inherent in the people; and that all free governments are, and of right ought to be, founded on their authority, and instituted for their peace, safety and well-being," are of course elated at the democratic tendency of the times, but on the other hand for some of the nations we can only hope that the enlightened leaders may succeed in steering the ship of state through these turbulent times without disaster.

As trustees we are entrusted with this enlightenment of the people through the agency of the public library, and we are certainly blind to the world of affairs if the crises through which the nations are

passing have not brought us to a full realization of the supreme importance of our work and the necessity for its early extension to every unit of society.

If knowledge is essential to the preservation of a free government, any means by which learning can be generally diffused should have the unqualified support of every believer in true democracy. That public libraries furnish one of the potent means of enlightening the people has been recognized by the law making body of every state in the union.

We were told last year by Mr. Brett, that the several states in forming a federal Union retained the right and duty of educating the people. In fulfilling this duty the state necessarily passes laws. The question of what is the most efficient library legislation, and the more practical question of how to obtain such legislation, has engaged the thought of the best minds in the library field. Every side and phase of the question has been studied and discussed and I cannot hope to add anything new, other than some personal observations based upon the working of our Indiana law, in the hope that they may be of assistance to some while we are waiting for the model law to crystallize.

In the excellent address by Mr. Hicks before the Asbury Park Conference last year, he stated that in only one state, Michigan, do we find a definite constitutional provision concerning public libraries. While the word "library" is not found in our Indiana constitution we have a provision therein, which our supreme